

REVISION OF CATALOGUING RULES — PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE¹

BY ÁKOS DOMANOVSKY

In the preface to the fourth edition of his epochal handbook, Cutter comments with obvious resignation: "I cannot help thinking that the golden age of cataloguing is over and that the difficulties and discussions which have furnished an innocent pleasure to so many will interest them no more. Another lost art."²

Although similar views are often voiced by our contemporary librarians claiming that cataloguing rules should be left alone and applied without further consideration, this outlook, since World War II anyway, seems to reflect only that of the minority. In recent times an increasing number of experts from all over the world seem to be engaged on investigating the necessity of a revision of existing cataloguing codes, a trend which culminates in the Paris International Conference, summoned to discuss the detailed rules of cataloguing.

In the face of these circumstances and in an atmosphere so much susceptible to the revision of prevailing ideas one is compelled to wonder, how Cutter, a librarian of erudition and experience, could have possibly so much missed the mark? The answer, however, is quite obvious. Cutter was a typical progeny of the 19th century, and the quotation cited above, though dated 1903, has a genuine 19th century flavour. He was, like many of his contemporaries, so much impressed with the magnificent progress of his times that he believed achievements having been reached beyond which no improvement would be feasible.

Indeed, Cutter's attitude may be excused on grounds of the vast progress accomplished within a comparatively short space of time. "Before the Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue were made" writes Cutter, "catalogues seemed to me to be chaotic collections of empirical entries. I tried to find a few simple principles around which all desirable practices could be grouped."³ This self-evaluation is nearly correct. Ever since the end of the 18th century the task of cataloguing has become a more and more intricate business. The rising production of books coupled with the until then unheard-of growth of library holdings (abolition, French revolution, etc.), the appearance of various new types of publications, and the transformation of forms in publishing as well as the rapidly rising demands of library patrons, have all called for a more elaborate and more up to date type of author and title catalogue. The heretofore existing small number of definite and clearcut rules of cataloguing have become insufficient, the catalogues under the changed circumstances could no longer fulfill their purpose — particularly so the rules governing the selection of entry words, upon which the efficacy of cataloguing largely depends. Pressed by the trend of times, these rules began in the larger libraries to produce proliferations whereby the usages of these libraries became inevitably more complex and intricate, whilst remaining essentially local in character. Although a minority of smaller libraries subsequently adopted the practices of more prominent ones, the bulk of libraries was labouring under conditions of isolation, grappling individually with the problems to be solved to the best of their knowledge, and arriving

at solutions which were not only too variegated but often more or less unfortunate. In most cases the determining factor underlying these new solutions was tradition. The new rules arose mostly out of the old usages, out of the single and accidental decisions based thereupon. The aim to find rational solutions was a matter of secondary consideration only.

A first effort to harness this unbridled stream of rules was presented by Panizzi whose epoch-making code, published in 1841, may have been also the first step towards reducing the number of individual systems. The principles evolved by Panizzi have in turn influenced Jewett (1852) and later Cutter, whose code, published in 1875, and relying on both of these authorities, is an important milestone on the road of which Panizzi was the pioneer. The effect of this overdue work was such as to induce two years later the American Library Association to appoint a committee with a view to preparing "condensed rules for an author and title catalogue." The rules laid down by Panizzi, Jewett and Cutter gradually suppressed former complex and confusing, frequently inconsistent and unexpedient practices, and provided the English-speaking world with a new cataloguing system which proved more rational, logical and effective than any of the systems adopted heretofore. That Cutter miscalculated the trend of events in years to come is thus indeed not difficult to explain: the system created with his participation presented such a vast improvement over previous ones that he who witnessed the errings of the past, had every justification to believe that the present has reached perfection and finality.

In spite of this, we, nowadays, cannot help smiling at Cutter's error. We have accustomed ourselves to think no longer of any kind of human achievements, whether important or trifle, in terms of finality. Even such unpretentious activities as cataloguing are not exceptions to this rule. Here, too, any slowdown in the pace of progress or disproportion between demand and available facilities would inevitably impair the efficacy and serviceability of catalogues. Since, however, the objectives and the readers of libraries, along with their holdings, are constantly and gradually changing, Cutter's views on the future of cataloguing must be intrinsically wrong.

But there is still another point hard to understand. Whatever results were reaped at the time by the revision of hitherto existing cataloguing rules initiated partly by Cutter himself, these achievements may hardly be considered complete and impeccable even by the standards of those times. This specially applies to the ALA cataloguing code itself, based mainly upon Cutter's principles and more or less completed by the time Cutter has voiced the opinion cited above. But it applies also to the rules adopted by the Library of Congress, dating back to the same period and closely related to the ALA-rules. Essentially the same may be said also of the other important code the Prussian Instructions, produced by the last quarter of the 19th century, that great reform age of cataloguing.

To students of the subject this must appear as a matter of course. In point of fact, the provisions of these codes were deep-rooted in and closely related to general practices hitherto prevailing. The process of selective elimination to which these practices were subjected by the two fundamental codes was yet incomplete. Whatever credit may be given to these codes, the fact remains that their achievements were far from perfection, and undesirable weeds, even solid stalks flourishing in the back-garden of old practices, were preserved and incorporated into them. No wonder, in the pursuit of intellectual work weeding is always a slow, intermittent and difficult business. Even the greatest geniuses, whilst extirpating a fallacy, are only too often apt to overlook another nearest to it. Further complications

are presented by the special difficulties and pitfalls of code-compiling; it is hardly feasible to foresee every contingency in the course of conceiving an elaborate system of rules, the popping up of all unpleasant consequences of a certain prescription at some distant points of the system.

To get rid of remnants which no longer fit into the framework of an up to date code but still persist in spite of the reform movement of the last quarter of the 19th century, will be one of the main objectives of our present-day drive for revision of existing cataloguing rules. Since this is the next and most immediate task on our agenda, a closer investigation of its character cannot be dispensed with. An analysis of some samples of our existing cataloguing rules below will reveal that such a revision is inevitable and overdue, the terminology of our present rules being often ambiguous or obscure, their framework illogical, their provisions frequently nebulous, inconsistent or irrational, and the reliability and efficiency of our catalogues prepared with the help of an instrument having such deficiencies being, of course, questionable.

*

The first prerequisite of the logical structure of any code is precise terminology. Whilst in the case of cataloguing rules it is desirable that terminology should follow, as far as possible, the pattern of everyday language, clarity and accuracy are even more important considerations overruling all claims for colloquial usage. Unfortunately, a close analysis of terminology used in our existing codes will convince anybody that these abound with vague and obscure concepts, including those of the author, the joint author and the editor, to quote just a few of the most common ones. Not unfrequently, codes go even so far as to apply the same word to denote a variety of different concepts.

A typical example to illustrate this may be taken from the Prussian Instructions.⁴ Of all the national codes it is the latter that ranks first in logic, our example is therefore of conclusive evidence in supporting our point, other codes being even worse off so far as logic is concerned.

Let us examine the use of the word *Titel*, one of the most important terms of the PrI. In this code the concept of title is referred to as *Sachtitel*, whilst the term *Aufnahme* is used to denote both the act of preparing an entry and its product, the entry, and *Titelblatt* stands for title-page. But the compilers of the code were inconsistent in carrying their own terminology into effect, inasmuch as they use the word *Titel* — in accordance with everyday usage — unrestrictedly to denote three of these four concepts, even in the subdivisions of the same rule. Moreover, we would hardly need to go too far to discover further applications of the word. Take, for instance, rule 47 in which *Titel* seems to stand for heading or entry word.

Inaccuracies of this kind are, of course, quite unpardonable, not only because a code is justly expected to express its intentions with utmost clarity and precision, but also on account of the unpleasant consequences such inaccuracies in the wording of rules always produce in the practical application thereof. At this juncture, the point may be raised that the shortcomings described here do not detract anything from the value of the PrI, German cataloguing practice being of a high standard of unity and consistency. Such reasoning would only partly be true. As a matter of fact, the highly developed German cataloguing practice did comprehend the intentions of code-writers despite the poor means by which the latter sometimes expressed themselves and partly succeeded in preventing the contradictions of the code from getting a foothold in the catalogues themselves. But in spite of this beneficial

influence of cataloguing usage the effects of the shortcomings of the code are not to be underestimated: the fact remains that some of their practical consequences do exist and do persist.

One of such unpleasant consequences is the fact that some of the rules containing the word *Titel* are in themselves not intelligible and that a novice is hard-pressed to understand the real meaning behind their provisions. But the same applies also to practice in general: the unity and integrity of German cataloguing usage are due to the tireless efforts incorporated in the *Gesamtkatalog* and the *Berliner Titeldrucke*, both of which have certainly in many instances arrived at consistency only at the cost of painstaking work which could have been spared, should accurate definitions have been available in the code. Inaccuracies in codes are bound to have an adverse effect upon literature on cataloguing as well, retarding the development of clear and correct terminology in the field of theory and education, since literature, for obvious reasons, is not prepared to use a terminology which is at variance with that of the national code. Finally, it seems inevitable that in spite of utmost care such confusing rules should exert an unfavourable influence in border cases and thereby endanger the integrity and reliability of our catalogues.

Let us examine some special cases resulting from the chaotic use of the word *Titel*. Rule 3 of PrI enumerates various categories of *Titel*. Of these *Umschlagtitel*, *Rückentitel*, *Kopftitel* and *Schlusstitel* are undoubtedly kinds of titles, while *Vortitel* and *Zwischentitel* are both, according to their description as „*Titel ohne Erscheinungsvermerk*” (title without imprint), obviously kinds of title-pages — otherwise the criterion „*ohne Erscheinungsvermerk*” would make no sense at all. In other words, two entirely different concepts are mixed up here — in the very introductory part dealing with terminology! — as a result of the inconsequent use of the word *Titel*. An immediate consequence of this is the lack of an enumeration of the various kinds of title-pages, and these two mistakes lead in actual practice to the more significant one of giving two different meanings to the word *Haupttitel* (main title). The effect is obvious: whenever a book with several titles has to be dealt with, the rules governing the selection of the main title are becoming hopelessly vague and confusing.

According to rule 3 *Haupttitel* is the *Titel* giving the most comprehensive or most general description of the work („...*der die vollständigste oder allgemeinste Beschreibung der Schrift enthält*”). Apart from the use of the word *oder* which alone suffices in certain cases to render the definition useless, the wording of the latter may as much refer to the main title as to the main title-page. Since rule 3, in which the concept of *Haupttitel* is thus defined, provides a mixed enumeration of various kinds of titles and title-pages, the point whether this definition of *Haupttitel* refers to the main title or to the main title-page, is a matter open for speculation. An answer as to what is meant by *Haupttitel* in terms of PrI has to be looked for elsewhere. To facilitate matters, we suggest to overlook in our further considerations the problem of books published under titles different from their original. In other words, let us forget about complications arising out of the second function of the catalogue, a matter which is dealt with separately in a series of special rules by PrI as well.

In cataloguing practice we are wont to select as a main title out of the various different titles appearing in the book the title most emphasized by the main title-page, whether or not a “more complete or more general” title, as is often the case, appears at other parts of the book. We are, therefore, fully justified in assum-

ing that by *Haupttitel*, in terms of rule 3, really the main title-page and not the main title is meant. This view is further corroborated by rule 8/1 stipulating that „*bei Schriften mit mehreren Titeln wird der Haupttitel ... der Aufnahme zugrunde gelegt*” — this provision affording conclusive evidence to the effect that every meaning of the term *Haupttitel* other than that of the main title-page, would be in conformity neither with general nor with German cataloguing usage.

The same term, however, appears in other parts of the code, as mentioned above, to denote not the main title-page but the main title. Thus, for instance, rule 216, dealing with untranslated works having several titles and to be entered under title, declares that „*finden sich die verschiedenen Titel auf verschiedenen Titelblättern, so wird das OW [Ordnungswort] dem Haupttitel (§ 3,1) entnommen.*” By *Haupttitel*, in this case, undoubtedly main title is meant; as the rule is keeping the two different concepts of *Titel* and *Titelblatt* distinctly apart, it is impossible to suppose, that the authors would have taken the liberty of using the term *Haupttitel* to denote *Haupttitel* as well as *Haupttitelblatt* within the very same phrase. Thus we have no alternative but to accept the implications of the rule to the effect that it is the main title, after all, that really matters, whether it appears on the main title-page or not. In other words, this provision is in open and irreconcilable conflict with both actual cataloguing practice and our interpretation of rules 3 and 8/1.

Are these contradictions to be resolved by simply assuming that the definition in rule 3 is to be applied at the same time to the main title and the main title-page? The answer is no, since we are only too well aware that a main title in keeping with this definition is frequently not to be found on the main title-page conforming to the definition. Nor can we escape from the grip of contradictions by declaring that title-page to be the main title-page, on which the main title, i. e. the most comprehensive and most general one, appears, for our criteria of a main title-page are entirely different and the main title as defined by PrI does not necessarily appear on a title-page.

To sum up the situation, PrI, in case of several titles, does not state unmistakably which of these be given precedence as a main title, which one may be just mentioned in a note and which one may be omitted altogether. A grave mistake! Just think of the books to be catalogued under title headings! No doubt, had the writers of the code been more careful with their terminology, a confusion such as outlined here would have been quite impossible.

As far as the ill-effects of this miscarried piece of terminology are concerned, it will be not uninteresting to devote a few moments' attention to the prominent commentary of Hermann Fuchs to the PrI, and to his interpretation of the concept of the *Haupttitel*, respectively. Commenting upon rule 3 writes Fuchs: „*Als Haupttitel gilt derjenige, der durch seine Stellung oder durch seine grössere Vollständigkeit vor den andern hervortritt. Er steht in der Regel am Anfang der Schrift auf einem besonderen Titelblatt (Haupttitelblatt), und enthält meist die vollständigste Beschreibung der Schrift.*”⁵ Fuchs, as will be observed, transforms the definition of the *Haupttitel* into a downright definition of the main title. In doing so, he tries to save as much of the wording of the definition of PrI as possible, but by adding a number of new factors, however, he completely changes its character. The aim of some of these additions is to span the above mentioned contradiction prevailing between the interpretation of PrI's *Haupttitel*-concept as main title, and the general usage, which latter is undoubtedly in full accord with the intentions of PrI. Of course, this attempt is a complete failure: Fuchs' definition leaves no doubt as to considering his main title the basis of cataloguing, even if the same is not to be found on the main

title-page. It should be observed that rule 8/1 of PrI, essential for the interpretation of the term *Haupttitel*, is not mentioned by Fuchs at all. Moreover, Fuchs does not succeed in his obvious objective of remodeling the enumeration of rule 3 into a homogeneous list of the different kinds of titles: his definitions of both *Vortitel* and *Zwischentitel* do not fit into the framework of title at all. Furthermore, it may be said that the inconsequent use of the word *Titel* by Fuchs produces even more contradictions and ambiguities of practical consequence than that of the PrI, he himself producing a fresh meaning for that term, this time to denote the sum total of data required for or used in making an entry.

Our choice of illustrations demonstrating the confusion created by the unrestricted use of the word *Titel* is far from being complete. Thus, for instance, rule 184 of PrI stipulating that „für die Einordnung kommt nur der Titel selbst in Betracht“, seems to make no sense at all. In defence of PrI we may add that whilst this observation is formally correct, it follows from the context that *Titel*, in this case, may stand for *Sachtitel* only. A similarly lenient interpretation, however, would be out of place in regard to rules 49 and 58, declaring that all publications containing reproductions of art objects, and those containing laws, patents and bulls have to be entered under the name of the artist and legislator respectively, provided that the latter are „im Titel genannt“. No doubt, a thorough examination of all provisions of PrI would reveal a further choice of rulings rendered by the word *Titel* problematical.

*

We turn now to another group of illogical provisions in our codes, the plain contradictions and the discrepancies between one part of a code and the other. Let us illustrate our case with a Hungarian example: the entry of compound names, as ruled by the successive Hungarian codes. This choice will also point at another source of frequent mistakes: to the careless or superficial reception of rules from other codes. That existing codes have a decisive influence upon those under preparation is a well-known fact. New codes are only too often no more than a compilation of rules of older codes, adding a few alterations to what has been adopted. Some of these alterations are indeed apt to refine and improve the original conception and may be hailed as a welcome addition to our cataloguing methods, while others, with not sufficient understanding of the points at issue, only impair the original. Meanwhile, such miscarried modifications may, in turn, produce fresh ones and mark the beginnings of a new tradition. Thus a small error in interpretation at the outset, once incorporated in a new code, is apt in the codes dependent on this one to develop into a serious mistake and to give rise to undesirable practices which in the long run may spread and suppress sound practices based upon the original conception.

Let us now see our example. At first glance it seems that the „Rules for the Union Catalogue”,⁶ the first Hungarian cataloguing code, in dealing with compound names simply copies the provisions of PrI. The fundamental rule of the latter prescribes that all compound names, whether joined by hyphen, preposition or conjunction, or unjoined, are to be entered under the first part of the name (rule 115). In line with this, the rule prescribes only the first part of the name to be — written in capitals. The motive underlying this provision is obvious: PrI is anxious to have compound names filed in close vicinity to the single names which form the first half of the compound name. The tendency is perfectly justified, every other filing order would be a definite nuisance to the reader. By prescribing the same entry word for both

single and compound names PrI prevents other entry words from being interposed. If the two parts of compound names were jointly to form the entry word, this objective could not be fulfilled. The main provision of PrI is in conformity with that of the ALA-rules, but the typographical arrangement prescribed by the former is more in accord with this main provision than that of the latter.

These provisions are supplemented in PrI by two further rules dealing with references. The first is a sequel of the fundamental rule, prescribing in general a reference from the second part of the name (rule 116). The second appears in a more distant part of the code as a supplement of the rule dealing with the filing order of compound names. By this rule single names have to be given precedence to all compound names of which they form the first part; if necessary, a reference may be made from the single name — i. e. more precisely: from the first part of the compound name — to the compound name (rule 173). The fact that these two rules dealing with references appear in two distant parts of the code is fully justified by the logical context.

By adding these rules on references, provisions of PrI governing the treatment of compound names may said to be complete. Thanks to this arrangement compound names may now be traced not only under the second but also under the first separate part of the name whenever that first part is a more common name and the respective single and compound names are likely to form in the catalogue two separate groups. The application of a reference to the compound name among the entries of authors bearing only the first part of the compound name, at the place determined by the forename, is undoubtedly at least as indispensable as a reference from the second part of the name. In fact, a reference from the first part of the name cannot be dispensed with unless by filing the main entry we are prepared to overlook the second part of the name completely. Nor can any objection be made to PrI in not prescribing a reference from compound names regarded as one-word single names; the two parts of the name being separated sharply by the PrI both in form and function, there is no reason to refer from a compound name as a single word unit.⁷ To sum up, provisions of PrI dealing with the treatment of compound names may be considered perfectly reasonable and correct.

Let us now see, how the Hungarian Library Board is incorporating these rules into its own code? To begin with, it should be understood that this code, just as the PrI, is a code not only of cataloguing but also of filing rules.

The general principle as laid down in rule 59 is an almost verbatim translation of rule 115 of PrI. The examples attached to this rule follow the pattern of PrI even in that only the first part of the compound names is written in capitals. The code, however, "printed as a manuscript" and prepared in great haste, incorporated several provisions, rather by error than intentionally, representing a definite departure from PrI. One of these is presented by rule 185 dealing with the filing of homonymous personal names. Although the rule itself is in keeping with PrI, stipulating that "all entries under compound surnames (family names)" are to be arranged after the respective single names, — in the examples to follow, contrary to rule 59, the second part of the name, too, is printed in capitals. Owing to this typographic oversight, some of the Hungarian libraries began treating all compound names as single-word units, thereby abandoning the excellent rule of PrI. This practice was encouraged by the H. L. B. itself by using bold-faced type not only for the first but also for the second part of compound names in its printed union lists, thereby departing from the correct rule 59 and complying with what was wrong in rule 185.

Another deficiency of the code is the omission of the salutary provision of PrI prescribing that a reference from the first part of the name is to be added whenever necessary. The compilers of the Hungarian code, whilst adopting rule 116 of PrI calling for a reference (rule 150), overlooked the equally important similar stipulation of rule 173 of PrI. Thus the simple fact that the topic of references appears — for sound reasons — at two distant parts of PrI, had far-reaching consequences in its Hungarian counterpart.

Once the stone began rolling, nothing could stop it. Errors inadvertently slipped into the original 1928 H. L. B.-code reappear as a bunch of staunch principles in the 1944 revision of the code.⁸ What is a mere typographical oversight in the former, is a solid rule in the latter. "Compound names ... constitute jointly the entry word" says rule 60 of this revised code. Departure from the original source, the PrI, becomes thereby complete. No longer does the separate first part of a compound name count as an entry word, but the whole compound name amalgamated into a single word; eventual separation of compound names from single names corresponding to the first part of the compound names is now decreed by a rule. This makes it even harder to understand than in the case of the first code, why the new code providing for a reference from the second part of the compound name, does not prescribe a reference from the first part as well? (rule 162.) Thus the repeated twisting, changing and remodeling of an originally sound principle finally results in a new solution which, besides having nothing to do with the original, is also fundamentally wrong and illogical.

The recent Hungarian library standards take contradictory views on the subject. The Standard for Cataloguing declares that a reference from the second half of the compound name is only required "when usage is unstable", for the rest all the provisions and errors of the 1944 code remain unchanged (rules 50/a and 178/g).⁹ The Standard for Filing takes a sounder view by saying that "each part of a double or compound name is to be treated as an independent word unit" (rule 38). Although in permitting to arrange personal names in a grouped order, it is not adverse to all single names preceding double ones, but it is more so to every interposition between a single name and a compound name the first component of which is the single name: the examples of the respective rule clearly indicate that names like Kovács-Keszi, Kovács-Koltai or Kovács-Váradí have to be given precedence to the name Kovácsik (rule 27).¹⁰ These rules, of course, are in direct contradiction to the rule of the Standard for Cataloguing stating that "double names have to be regarded jointly as entry words". It would be interesting to find out how the Hungarian libraries are divided in taking sides with either of these conflicting rules?

*

Of all shortcomings of the two fundamental codes and of those following their footsteps the most considerable group consists of rules formally correct but nevertheless calling for revision on account of the fact that they disagree with the objectives of the catalogue, that is to say, lack in logic functionally. To this category belong the rules which fail to enhance the efficacy of the catalogue to an extent which would justify the effort invested, or those aiming at targets which cannot be attained but to the detriment of others, whereby the whole conception becomes fruitless. This group of wrong rules, having an adverse effect upon the general standard of cataloguing work by being ineffective, is undoubtedly that among the three groups which has the most heavy consequences. In this connection suffice it to mention

two of the greatest errings of the world's most prominent two codes: the rules governing the corporate author entry and the *substantivum regens*, both a perfect nuisance to reader and cataloguer. In addition to these two highly controversial groups there are to be found rules and groups of rules of a minor importance, equally wrong in concept. To get rid of these would be a further most desirable task and one likely to meet with less difficulties, because modifications of minor importance do not harm the continuity of the catalogues as much as the jettisoning of central conceptions. As for this group of undesirable rules, an example is quoted from ALA below.

According to ALA all surnames preceded by a preposition, article or a combination thereof are subject to a double rule. Whether such prefixes are to be considered an unalienable part of a surname or just a casual addition to be disregarded in filing, depends on two factors: on the origin of the name, i. e. its linguistic derivation, and on the actual nationality of its bearer (rule 39/B). If the two factors are in harmony, the prefix is to be treated according to the usage of the country of origin of the name, if not, i. e. if the person or the family of that name are immigrants, the usage of the adoptive country is to be applied.¹¹ In principle, therefore, whenever a name is combined with a prefix, both the origin of the name and the nationality of its bearer have to be investigated. None of these two tasks is too easy. Although by most prefixes the linguistic origin of the name is easily recognizable, still, there are exceptions, e. g. prefixes used by several languages within the same family of languages (de, la, del), or prefixes assumed by immigrants to make their name sound less foreign. To ascertain the nationality of the bearer of a name is a task far more difficult. Nowadays a great many of authors, for the most part scientists, leave their native country at some time or other of their career and start writing books in the language of their adoptive country. In many cases it is hard to find out whether such an author is just a visitor or an actual immigrant in that country, i. e. whether or not he has changed nationality. If he has, and the prefix of his name is such that change of nationality involves a change of the form in which the name has to be entered, the unpleasant necessity of adjusting entries of the works written formerly in his native language will also arise. Another source of difficulty is presented by authors with a name with prefix whose books written in a foreign language are published abroad. Although such persons might have never left their native country, if there is any discrepancy in the usage of the prefix of their name between the native and the adopted language, the librarian has to find out all about their past.

Such an arrangement is obviously unreasonable. A catalogue is not likely to gain in efficacy if the librarian is compelled to alter entries when an author chooses to change his nationality. Would it not be far more expedient to leave the matter of prefixes exclusively with the usage of the language to which they belong, as the PrI and the auxiliary regulations of the Soviet code do? Is it really logical that an author whose French works we have entered under La Faille has to be re-christened De La Faille upon emigrating to Sweden and plain Faille when, to our dismay, he once more changes his nationality to become this time a Dutch author? Or, finally, is it logical that three members of the same family living in three different countries should be entered at three different parts of the catalogue? Undoubtedly, the acceptance of every language's own usage would be far more expedient, especially if by international agreement a uniform treatment of the same prefix could be reached whatever its meaning (e. g. indicating nobility, place of origin, etc.), even if it belongs to more than one language or to a language spoken by more than one nation.

Instead of this simple and effective arrangement the Anglo-American code resorted to its present less reasonable and more intricate rule for the simple reason that English everyday usage treats all prefixes of immigrant authors as inseparable parts of the surnames, even if different practices be carried on by the native country of such authors. This usage was transplanted into bibliographical practice, regardless of the fact that here it involves no end of secondary problems and complications, and is taxing both reader and librarian to an extent in no way justified by the advantage derived from securing the conformity of bibliographical usage with everyday treatment in a matter of minor importance. The rule is characteristic to ALA with its trend for discrepancy between the end obtained and the painstaking means leading to it. Moreover, it is inconsistent as well: whilst ready in this instance for a great sacrifice to the benefit of everyday usage, in some other instances it completely overlooks the considerably more important fundamental usages of foreign countries and tongues in handling their own prefixes (e. g. Italian prefixes, German articles combined with prepositions), to the obvious detriment of American and British libraries and readers. The further fact, that by sheer negligence and lack of critical aptitude several other national codes should simply copy these provisions, although having even less reason in doing so than ALA, is another example for careless reception in the field of cataloguing rules.

*

The two prominent codes of Cutter's time, along with those following their footsteps, are the basis of our work to-day notwithstanding the confusing, unwary and ineffective rules of which we demonstrated a few samples above. Our present task therefore may be summarized thus: revision of the deficient rules of our existing codes, combined with the drafting of fresh and more up to date rules wherever made necessary by the trend of changed demand or of other circumstances, based fundamentally still upon the design of the two prominent codes, but improved on by the experience of over half a century. Some decisive steps towards that goal have already been undertaken. Thus both in Germany and the United States, after a good deal of preparatory work, two separate drafts of what might become one day the basis of a new edition of a cataloguing code were prepared, incorporating suggestions for some drastic changes.¹² The German draft shows considerable prowess in jettisoning a fundamentally wrong central principle, whilst the American one is distinguished by great proficiency and determination in its endeavour to re-shape and rationalize the pattern, the method, the complete structure of the code. Further welcome progress is likely to be brought about by the International Cataloguing Conference in Paris which, even in its preparatory stages, has succeeded in focusing general attention to the outstanding issues of cataloguing principles and practices more than ever experienced heretofore.

What results this world-wide drive for the revision of cataloguing rules is likely to reap in the long run, remains to be seen. The strength of opponents, bent upon the continuance of present-day usages, is not to be underestimated. Only the future will show how far the new ideas and suggestions are likely to be acceptable to the other side, that is to say, what kind of a compromise may be reached. One thing, however, seems certain: the contest is bound to end in a compromise. Many of the solutions to be brought about will be far from what we may consider the optimum, progress will be in all probability checked somewhere halfway by tradition, a powerful force in the field of librarianship and especially of cataloguing. The drafts so far prepared are a clear indication of this trend. Despite many a radical

solution incorporated by them, much of what we have grown accustomed to still lingers on even where a way towards better, more effective solutions is already recognized, whether or not the retention of such obsolete elements fits into their pattern. Neither of these two drafts extirpate completely all weeds of former errors — for example the German draft is still at loggerheads with that unfortunate word *Titel* and the American one is not prepared to abandon the present practice in regard to surnames with prefixes. Moreover, the process of these drafts developing into a code will no doubt further increase the number of solutions far from being ideal. When the present reform drive will come to an end, codes will still be imperfect, calling for further improvements. But in the field of cataloguing permanent revision is not permissible. Revision may only be proceeded with at greater intervals, when justified by the extent and portent of the accumulated issues at hand. Whilst a practice to the contrary would inevitably render catalogues liquid and less efficient, this does not necessarily mean that in the intervals all considerations for improvement have to be suspended. This applies also to the near future: there will be plenty to think about immediately after the tide of the present-day movement is ebbing down. It is not so much the problems continually presented by fresh developments, we are alluding to, but the obvious fact that certain obsolete elements, an heritage of Cutter's time, will be left behind with revision completed. Very likely, at the next drive for revision, which may be somewhere around the year 2000, our grandchildren may still find a good many of these remnants firmly embedded in some valid rule or other.

But let us see, what are the perspectives of the immediate future? What are the next changes to be anticipated?

One of the most characteristic features of the present-day drive for revision is the tendency to eliminate those elements of traditional cataloguing practice which render the use of our catalogues more complex without improving their efficacy. The tendency becomes even more marked whenever it comes to traditional rules which explicitly impair the efficacy of catalogues just by being much too complex. In other words, our most immediate objective is to rationalize our cataloguing methods, i. e. to find the ways and means by which our aims may be put into effect in the simplest way. The projects in hand as well as the theoretical papers on the subject are apt to reveal the outline of modern conceptions on the desirable future development of rational codes. The first aim of these is to transform the traditional inaccuracies and loose network of present-day rules into a logical, consistent and solid pattern. Upon this platform some further principles are based. One of these aims at a simplification of codes by reducing the number of special rules and exceptions dealing with matters of minor importance. The next one is the claim that as far as possible all cataloguing rules should be based rather on the formal marks than on the contents of books. What the latter principle suggests is that rules dealing with the cataloguing of special types of publications be as far as possible omitted and replaced by rules for different cataloguing conditions created by the various combinations of the formal marks of books. The argument more or less embodied in all our present-day codes that it was for psychological reasons, i.e. with a view to meeting the anticipations of the reader, that rules for certain special groups of books of minor importance were created, is refuted by many experts as perfectly unjustified. That is to say, in contrast with former ideas, the modern approach to a certain cataloguing problem is always governed by the code as an organic unity, by its structure as a whole, refusing to look upon these problems from a particular point of view and maintaining that it is really the functional harmony

of the code that serves the reader best and not the gratification of his anticipations of the heading of individual works or special types of publications.

Such cataloguing principles, if universally adopted, may not only dispose of a large majority of our special rules but may also produce considerable changes in the use of our fundamental entry word categories. We have every reason to believe that in a not too distant future the whole complex of the *substantivum regens* will be completely shelved, together with the useless distinction between institutes and societies in dealing with corporate bodies. Theoretical discussions on the subject have gone even further, forecasting the possibility or probability that not only group and form headings and subject heading-like entry words may disappear from our codes, but also that the separate form of corporate headings for government publications as well as the corporate headings of main entries themselves may be completely jettisoned.

The suggestions outlined above are already under consideration in our days. No doubt, however, the younger generation will live to see other changes too, such as we do not foresee and not even imagine today.

Projects for revision were so far solely governed by the desire of improving the utilization of traditional elements headings are composed of, i. e. of such marks as were and still are being added to the text by the author, editor or publisher to facilitate the identification, distinction and cataloguing of a book. But why should not cataloguing technique in due course proceed to the same level of development industrial technology has already reached? The latter is no longer satisfied with the choice of available working materials, but seeks for new formulae to produce ones best suitable for its requirements by synthetic means. Are we over-optimistic in assuming that cataloguing one day may discard its present "natural" entry words and create "synthetic" ones by which an entry may much easier be found?

It may be imagined, for instance, that a drab and undistinctive title of an anonymous book may be replaced by a striking brief and conspicuously printed sign or keyword by which an entry could be far more easily located than by a corporate heading or a title entry. There have been similar attempts in the past. By ancient Greeks, for instance, anonymous works on certain subjects were entered under the name of a prominent author on the subject, even if that author had obviously nothing to do with those works. Such entry words may be regarded as a combination of the group headings of today and the "synthetic" headings, if any, of tomorrow. Within a more limited scope the same system was applied in naming the single works of known authors during the Classical Age, the Renaissance and the Baroque.

Furthermore, why not develop such an arrangement into a scheme from which some further benefits may be derived? What about an international system of book-symbols in which every country would be represented by a combination of letters and the printing presses of each country provided every year with a limited allotment of key numbers to mark each new book with, — an arrangement by which the possibility of using the same symbol for two different books would be excluded. The key number (e. g. CA 62—10256) could thus unmistakably establish the identity of a particular book and could also be used as a shelf number by libraries. Such an arrangement, whilst involving some sacrifice in space and from time to time a re-arrangement of shelves, would enable the reader or librarian looking for one particular volume and familiar with its key number, to find the book, without having to consult an author and title catalogue, with the help of a simple list of key-numbers. Furthermore, whenever the librarian would be aware that the volume is

available at, or the work obviously belonging to the scope of collection of the library, the use of any list or record could be completely dispensed with.

Of course, the future may have, even as far as the use of traditional entry word categories is concerned, some surprises in store. Indeed, even the possibility that at some future time our successors may feel justified in doing away with the most useful category of our present entry words, over 2000 years old, the personal author entry, is not altogether out of question. In a more distant future the bibliographical function of our present-day author and title catalogue, that of bringing together with a great deal of effort the entries for all works of one particular author, may be replaced by far more advanced bibliographical instruments than those used today. On the other hand, the more widespread use of libraries and the increasing popularity of reading may in the long run induce readers to make regularly a note of the relevant data of books they are looking for, instead of having just a vague recollection of title and author. Once these two conditions are fulfilled, the first function of the author and title catalogue, that of locating effectively any given book, would gain in importance to the detriment of the second function, i. e. that of bringing all books of a given author and all editions and translations of a given work together. Any considerable change in the balance of these two functions is bound to affect the selection of the entry word, that is to say, in case of more than one entry the choice of the heading of the main entry. Should function one, as mentioned above, outweigh function two, the main entry would be generally determined by function one, and its heading chosen, contrary to our present practice, in compliance with the given book, without any alteration whatever of its data. Under these circumstances, however, nothing would prevent us any longer from putting all our main entries under title headings, relegating all author headings to the added entries. By such an arrangement a positive benefit may be derived in that only one category of entry words would appear in the main entries. Uniform methods like this never fail to yield practical advantages. In addition to the above, several other possibilities are conceivable helping to overshadow function two. Thus, for instance, in principle the second half of this function, i. e. the bringing together of all editions and translations of a certain work, could be taken care of by the different subject catalogues as well, provided their efficiency and accuracy could be considerably improved. On the other hand, if one day our author and title catalogues were to be replaced by electronic computers, these would, perhaps, carry on only a finding list function, because the computers replacing our subject catalogues could perform the second function more economically.

We had better conclude our speculations of things to come by quoting a forecast on the future of author and title catalogues by an engineering expert. C. D. Gull, consultant analyst of the Informations Systems Section of the General Electric Company is firmly convinced that the role played now by library catalogues will be taken over by electronic computers in future. According to his view there is no inherent necessity that an electronically-stored catalogue be arranged alphabetically, that its records for all editions and translations of one work and for all works of one author be brought together physically, that the distinction between main entry and added entry be maintained, that the number of author entries used with any single work be subject to restrictions, etc., and as a climax he raises the question: will author and title entries be required for electronic information systems at all?¹³

The last question, we believe, is no longer within the scope of this paper, the latter being designed to discuss the possibilities of the not too distant future. In consideration of our present-day conceptions, our present design of books, the facilities now available

at libraries, and the mentality of our present readers, it is hard to imagine that libraries may be able to carry on without a central record in which a given book may be located with the help of its traditional marks, i. e. the name of its author or its title. This would be feasible only if all functions of our present author and title catalogues as well could be assumed by the automatic devices replacing our present-day subject catalogues or by such ones as are operating with "synthetic" symbols.

As for adapting our cataloguing rules to the technology of computers, we believe, the matter is by far not as urgent as suggested by Mr. Gull. He may be right that catalogues of today may sporadically be replaced by computers tomorrow. For the time being, however, computers are rare and expensive, while libraries are numerous and poor. Conventional catalogues, therefore, in the immediate future at least, are likely to carry on as before.

Our purpose in viewing at random a few possibilities of the future was simply to emphasize that cataloguing practices are intrinsically subject to change. Whether any of the fancies outlined above will come true, remains to be seen. Whatever be the merits of these speculations, one fact emerges at all events as certain: our author and title catalogues and their headings will keep on changing and the pace of these changes will probably be more rapid than ever before. Thus, librarians in times to come are not likely to be deprived of the "innocent pleasure" of discussing cataloguing principles, so widely indulged in by librarians of our times.

NOTES

¹ This paper was completed and sent to the printer in August 1961, the intended date of publication of the present Yearbook having been originally December 1961. This accounts for the results of the Paris Conference on Cataloguing Principles not being referred to therein.

² Cutter, Ch. A.: Rules for a dictionary catalog. 4th ed., rewritten, Washington, 1904. p. 5.

³ p. 40.

⁴ Instruktionen für die alphabetischen Kataloge der preussischen Bibliotheken vom 10. Mai 1899. 2. Ausgabe. Berlin, 1909, Behrend.

⁵ Fuchs, H.: Kommentar zu den Instruktionen für die alphabetischen Kataloge der preussischen Bibliotheken. Wiesbaden, 1955, Harrassowitz. p. 21.

⁶ A Központi Címjegyzék katalogizálási szabályai. [Cataloguing rules for the Union Catalogue. Printed as a manuscript.] Budapest, 1928, University Press. (= Országos Könyvforgalmi és Bibliográfiai Központ [Hungarian Library Board]. Ser. C. nr. 1.)

⁷ On the other hand it would be worth while investigating whether another reference from the compound name would not be desirable where the compound name would have to be filed in case its second half were only a forename. All arguments in favour of mechanical filing seem to make such a reference advisable.

⁸ A címfelvétel szabályai. Közreadja az Országos Könyvforgalmi és Bibliográfiai Központ. [Cataloguing rules. Edited by the Hungarian Library Board.] Budapest, 1944. (Multipl.)

⁹ Könyvtári címléírési szabályok. MSZ 3424—60. (= A könyvtári munka szabványai. Magyar Szabványügyi Hivatal.) [Cataloguing rules for libraries. Hungarian Standard 3424—60. In: Standards for library work. Ed. by the Hungarian Standards Office. 2nd ed.] Budapest, 1960.

¹⁰ A betűrendbe sorolás szabályai. MSZ 3401—58. (= A könyvtári munka szabványai. Magyar Szabványügyi Hivatal.) [Rules for filing. Hungarian Standard 3401—58. In: Standards for library work. Ed. by the Hungarian Standards Office. 2nd enlarged ed.] Budapest, 1960.

¹¹ A. L. A. Cataloging rules for author and title entries. 2nd ed, by Clara Beetle. Chicago, 1949, American Library Association. § 39.

¹² Regeln für den alphabetischen Katalog. Entwurf, vorgelegt vom Katalogausschuss des Verbandes der Bibliotheken des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Diskussionsentwurf. Köln, 1958, Photostelle der Universität. (Multipl.) — and — Code of cataloging rules: author and title entry. An unfinished draft for a new edition of cataloging rules, prepared for the Catalog Code Revision Committee by Seymour Lubetzky. March 1960, American Library Association. (Multipl.)

¹³ Gull, C. D.: How will electronic information systems affect cataloging rules? (= Librarian Resources and Technical Services. Vol. 5. no. 2. Spring 1961.)